



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 October 2020

by R Walker BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B3030/W/20/3248727

Field Reference 9161, Cross Lane, Collingham, Lincoln NG23 7PB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr E McCarthy against the decision of Newark & Sherwood District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02264/FUL, dated 20 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is proposed additional bay to existing store building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and whether there is an operational need for the proposed development in the countryside.

Reasons

3. Although the building is close to the settlement, it clearly forms part of the open countryside. The extension is compatible in design terms to the host building. However, it would result in a more dominant built form, encroaching into the countryside and would be prominent from Cross Lane and, to a lesser extent, from Swinderby Road. Given its location and scale the harm would be very small, nonetheless there would be harm.
4. The appeal building was approved as an agricultural building and I have no substantive evidence of any change of use. As such, the proposal falls to be assessed, amongst other things, against the requirements of Policy DM8 of the Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD). This stipulates, in relation to agricultural buildings, that *"proposals will need to explain the need for the development, its siting and scale in relation to the use it is intended to serve"*.
5. This policy makes provision for development which has an operational need for a countryside location. Consequently, for development to be acceptable in such a location that development must be necessary to enable that rural use to function. The appellant's submission of an application and willingness to fund the extension demonstrates a personal need for additional storage space. However, no detailed information has been provided regarding the existing use of the building, the operational need for the extension and how this is required

in connection with its countryside location. I cannot therefore be certain that a need exists for the extension proposed that warrants its countryside location.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a very small harmful effect on the countryside and no operational need for the proposed development in the countryside has been demonstrated. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with the requirements of Core Policy 9 and 13 of the Amended Core Strategy and Policies DM5 and DM8 of the DPD. These policies are concerned with, amongst other things, protecting the natural environment and character of the countryside. These policies are consistent with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and in this regard there would be conflict with the Framework.
7. The proposal would also conflict with the guidance within the Newark and Sherwood Landscape Character Assessment which, amongst other things, seeks to conserve the rural landscape.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would indicate that the appeal decision should be taken other than in accordance with it.
9. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Robert Walker

INSPECTOR